6/11/75

Mr. Tom Susman, counsel
Administrative Practises Subcommittee
Senate Office Bldg.
Washington, D.C.

Dear Tom,

It is not my purpose to add to the volume of what you read.

I do think you should know the contents of the enclosed letter to Rhoads and not strictly on FOIA. What relates to C.A.226-75 is probably clear enough. What relates to Nosenko may not be. From what I've received I know the FBI has to have withheld from the Warren Commission and I've received nothing indicating the CIA gave it anything. Nosenko said the Russians considered Oswald a "sleeper" agent and kept him under surveillance. The leaks that the KGB Moscow feared that the KBG Minsk had tried to recruit Oswald are false. Their actual basis was the report that Marina's uncle asked him not to be too anti-Soviet when the pair reached the U.S. This the Commission did know. Specifically counsel Coleman (now of the cabinet) and Slawson. I have their memo/analysis. All this was suppressed.

If the other possibilities I go into in the letter to Lesar are of any interest, there is much more I knew he knew and therefore did not mention. The CIA surveillance to which I refer has to do with my first-amendment rights and with the JFK assassination only insofar as I have proofs. They spied on my public appearances and I have copies of some but not all but proof of more. They denied it even after I told them I have copies and live witnesses.

If it does not represent too much trouble for you I'd appreciate copies of the Cotter and any other avaolable testimony on mail intercepts. There is a prima facie case that these cost me British publication of my first book. My mail did not reach my London agent and the publisher was fed bad information while he was drafting the contract. Prior to this the manuscript had been at one New York house since established as a CIA publisher and probably at more than one. It was the first book to suggest and give a basis for suggesting that Oswald had intelligence connections. One of my interests in this testimony is to see if it goes into what I believe is not impossible, interceptions of European mail other than to the USSR. Mine was intercepted, as it also was domestically. From my wartime intelligence experiences I know that outside Eastern Europe this presented no problem because cooperation at the destination would be normal practise.

C.A. 226-75 is getting pretty hairy. There has been no reaction to the charges I have made. In the course of preparing for a second affidavit to try to fructrate what I believe is afoot I have come accross what I regard as further perjury.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg